

WHOLE NO. 535.

But in a previous paragraph they found an argument for the transfer of the Emancipator on the assertion, that 'the editor's engagement would expire before the annual meeting.' With this absurd contradiction in remembering, we ask the reader to transfer

the resolution already quoted, providing for the payment of salaries up to the annual meeting!! It is an incontrovertible fact, that Joshua Leavitt received from the treasury of the American Society, after he entered the service of the City Society, a sum near-

ly adequate to sustain the Emancipator to the same date! We cannot appreciate the anxiety of the Committee to fulfil their contract with the editor for the few weeks of his unexpired term, while they violate the superior contract,—to sustain the official

The statement under review, says, 'that although appropriations were voted to defray the expenses of

appropriation were voted to defray the expenses of Messrs. Birney and Stanton to England, yet, in fact, not a cent in money was paid to either of them by the Executive Committee.' It matters little whether the money was paid or not—the Committee voted it, and it was no fault of theirs, if the result was *defeat*.

ferent from what they desired. They acknowledged the material point, the money was finally raised on a pledge of the Society's property, to pay in part, Messrs. Birney and Stanton's expenses; and those gentlemen were subsequently furnished with cre-

and whose interests the former faithfully served, by denying to the American Society, a representation in the London Convention.

conditional tender of the property of the Society to the annual meeting. That proposition was referred to the present Executive Committee of the American Society, who, after mature deliberation, declined acceding to it, for reasons which they deemed

We would advert, as briefly as the nature of the case will admit, to the professions of a pacific disposition, which are held out by our disaffected brethren.

ren. They deny that they are hostile to the American Anti-Slavery Society, or that they have made any attempt to injure it. We state in reply, that during the latter part of their administration of its affairs, they maintained a perpetual warfare against it, which was as much more destructive than that of

avowed enemies, as is the treachery of the commandant of a besieged fortress, more disastrous than the assaults of an external foe. The annals of Christian reform present no similar instance of desecrated trust, marked by such total abandonment of prin-

ciple. A parallel may be sought in vain even in the angry partizanship of political clubs. We have no desire to derogate from the character of our opponents in any respect; necessity alone forces us to an exposure of conduct, for which charity can find no other excuse than that of expediency.

appeal to every man's sense of justice—to his sense of Christian obligation, to decide whether it be right or wrong, to violate a solemn trust, confided without reserve, and sustained at such a sacrifice as was the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

The absence of all legal restraints whatever, proves how unconditional was that trust. *It was reposed* *scholly in the integrity and honor* of Arthur Tappan, Lewis Tappan, Joshua Leavitt, James G. Birney, Theodore S. Wright, Simeon S. Jocelyn, La Roy

Sunderland, Henry B. Stanton and Samuel E. Cornish. In their hands it was considered safe. Not the slightest suspicion rested on their fidelity to a pecuniary trust, whatever were the misgivings that obtained with regard to their sagacity on other subjects. But the result disappointed all feelings. We

behold them, on the most trivial pretexts, despoiling the Society, of which they were the chosen conservators, of its chief instrumentality, and with singular hardihood, placing it beyond the reach of recovery! On former occasions, when pressed by simi-

lar embarrassments, they had sent forth a stirring appeal for aid to prevent the suspension of their operations, but no warning voice was heard at this critical juncture, with reference to the Emancipator. The alleged inability of the Committee to sustain it, at a subsequent time, was doubtless to be expected.

—the alternative, it means should not be furnished for that purpose,—nay, even the *possibility* of its failure, were not so much as whispered of, to the friends of the cause. Such exposures would have brought prompt relief; but they would also have deprived the Committee even of the idlest pretext for the

We ask every impartial mind to pause, and to contemplate the position of the American and Foreign Committee. Can any one conceive of an act of higher hostility to the old Society, than is here

described? And yet that Committee says, in the document before us, 'As to the zeal with which we are charged, for the overthrow of the American Anti-Slavery Society—having never cherished it, we have never shown it.' That zeal was signally exhibited by Lewis Tappan, who, in 1833, was elected

initiated by Lewis Tappan, when he offered a resolution at one of the last meetings of the Executive Committee previous to the annual meeting in May, 1840, that the office of the American Anti-Slavery Society be abandoned! Although assented to by James G. Birney and other members, it was not officially

With respect to the assignment of the Society's property, referred to in one of the foregoing documents signed by Joseph Marriage, Jr., it is substan-

tially correct. The Executive Committee were conscious that they had lost the confidence of their constituents, and had good reason for supposing that they would be removed from office, at the approaching annual meeting. Three weeks previous to its assembling, after transferring the Emancipator, they

take possession of all the property of the Society, amounting to about \$12,000, and removed it to another building, in pursuance of the following resolution, offered by Lewis Tappan:

By order of Lewis Tappan, the sign was taken away from over the door, and deposited in the safe.

down from over the door, and deposited in the cellar of the new office. On being remonstrated with for this unnecessary act of hostility, and requested to place the sign at the door, he replied, that *the conditions on which the premises were rented, forbade it!* He was himself the negotiator for the office.

Thus was the office of the American Society destroyed by its own Executive Committee. Its stock, furniture, account books, files, &c. were transferred to the office of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, where they yet remain. And yet

that Society, whose very *output* was at our expense, and whose Executive officers were, and remain to be, the sequestrators of its property, thus standing in *perpetual aggressiveness* towards us, are proclaiming to the world that they cherish no animosity, and that they hold out to us the olive branch of peace!

We feel that there is some necessity for an apology on our part, for pursuing this unpleasant inquiry so much in detail. It has been to us a painful and reluctant task. But the historian has no right to interpose his own choice, in the selection of materials ;

We do not deem it necessary here to enter into discussion of every point which our opponents have brought forward. Those to which we have not addressed ourselves, we leave to our readers as subjects for their own consideration.

They were authorized, on their appointment, to establish a weekly paper to supply the place of the *Emancipator*.—After continuing its publication for

several months, they found themselves in a position of extreme difficulty with respect to funds. They

ere some sixty
ed claim, set up
insisted that t